1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The family and the flock are both termed divinely

confirmed, the earthly family being a refraction of the Holy archetype Family, while the sheep is a sacred animal blessed by God. These things have always been so, they always will be so. Life is sheep, children, and honour, mutually implicated elements none of which requires any justification of utility or profit. The family is the form in which these three elements are fused; and it is to a consideration of this circumstance and its consequences that the analysis now proceeds.

181 182 233 59

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

[p. 36]

III

KINSMEN AND AFFINES

1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KINSMEN

6/2 THE kindred (τὸ σόϊ) includes only those blood kinsmen of a man (or woman)[1] who are formally recognized for social purposes. The Sarakatsani recognize as members of the kindred all cognatic relatives as far as the degree of second cousin, whether these links are traced through the father's or mother's side of the family. In this system, all those persons descended from a man's four grandparents and their brothers and sisters are his kinsmen, except the children of his second cousins, the grandchildren of his first cousins, and the great-grandchildren of his own siblings, who are not members of his kindred. To express this in more general terms, the recognition for social purposes of collateral relations is relatively wide in a man's own generation and subsequently becomes, from his point of view, relatively less wide in each descendant generation. [602] As a man passes through life, critical events, such as his marriage and the birth of children, the marriages of these children and the birth of grandchildren, direct his obligations and interests to his own immediate descendants to the exclusion of collaterals.

6/2 ●59 Kindred relationships are considered by the Sarakatsani to be extensions from the family. Naturally, it is always a member of a man's elementary family who mediates his various relationships in the kindred, parents providing the links with grandparents, uncles, aunts, and cousins; siblings those with nephews and nieces. And although the kindred is a system of personal relationships while the family is a corporate group,[2] the systematic character of the former, and the structure of the latter, are necessarily interdependent and consistent.

[1] Except where there is ambiguity I shall not repeat this cumbersome qualification.

[2] Perpetuity is a quality often premised of corporate kinship groups, whereas Sarakatsan families are limited to a life of some 40 years, i.e. the period which normally elapses between a man's marriage and the division

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The Sarakatsan family is not only a domestic association of individuals with mutual affections based on blood relationship, it is a corporate group owning in common all significant property; and of this the leader, whether father or brother, is the trustee not the owner. Economically it struggles to become a self-sufficient unit with a division of labour organized about the service of its flocks; politically its members invariably act together. The individual in his work and behaviour is entirely committed to his family, whose prestige and reputation for honour are his foremost concern.

The family is also a religious community with its own 'sacra', icons, and other objects. In the popular mind it is an earthly reflection of the Heavenly Family of God the Father, the Mother of God, and Christ. Relations between members of a family ought to be modelled on the attitudes which, it is imagined, inspire the relations of the Heavenly archetype Family and its members. A father ought to have wisdom and foresight, a mother compassion, a son courage and respect, a daughter virginity, and so on.[3] Through grace, which descends in the sacrament of the Eucharist and through the icons, and in other ways, they are helped to achieve these modes of being, and in achieving them they partake, in a sense, of the condition of the Holy Family and are therefore less vulnerable as a group to material disaster or the spiritual attacks of the Devil. Through reference to a divine model, a man or woman in family life participates in a reality that transcends individuality; the harsh and ceaseless struggle to survive, even simple and often repeated actions such as carrying water or milking sheep, come to possess a validity which is absolute and intrinsic.

of the joint household by his married sons. Yet so long as it does last, the family group has in other respects a corporate jural existence and personality. Cf. Sir Henry Maine, *The Early History of Institutions*, London, 1893, p. 78.

The Sarakatsan family is a system of closed relationships and a group with a recognized leader. It holds all property in common and controls the productive powers of all its members and the reproductive capacities of its women. In principle all its members are held to be responsible for the action of any other member. It is with regard to these characteristics that I describe this group as 'corporate'.

[3] In the different aspects of her person, the Mother of God provides a model for both the mother and the daughter in the earthly family.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

59
612 The family is, indeed, the centre of the shepherd's world. Inside its limits he finds support, affection, and a sense of moral obligation. With certain qualifications these attitudes are extended to all the relations of the kindred. But outside the family and the kindred a man meets and expects only hostility and suspicion. There are conventions of conduct, but there is no general conscience of obligation to others. From the point of view of each individual, the community is divided into those who are kinsmen, a man's own people (δικοί), and those who are not kinsmen, that is strangers (ξένοι). There is a third intermediate category of persons, the affines (συμπέθεροι), strangers with whom a man or his kinsman has become related through a contract of marriage. Confidence, trust, and an altruistic concern about another individual's welfare can only exist between kinsmen, and it is only in a kinship relationship that a man is able to abandon the outlook of self-interest which normally guides him in relations outside the family.

571
602
619
[612]

612 It follows that a man looks towards his kinsmen for practical support. As we have seen, unrelated families are mutually opposed. The family, with reference to which the individual must act in almost all contexts of behaviour, faces a hostile community. Therefore this support is peculiarly important. Yet, in relation to the community's population of about 4,000 souls, the average size of an individual's kindred is small, seldom exceeding 250 men, women, and children of whom some 160 will be second cousins, a category of relations who are on the margin of kinship. Kinsmen are relatively few and correspondingly precious. In summer the kindred is scattered over 390 square miles of difficult and tortuous country, and a man does not, generally, live within an hour's walk of more than one-fifth of his kinsmen. This, in part, is the practical importance of kinship connexions; they offer a certain freedom of social manœuvre. Kinsmen established at strategic points through a community, which is numerically not small and geographically very dispersed, are able to offer hospitality and local information which pride and distrust prevent a man asking of unrelated persons. The network of a man's kinship relations provides him with a system of information and intelligence without which he cannot conduct his affairs efficiently or profitably. The price that he should ask for his milk, his wool, and animals for

[578]
[162]
[203]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

bride or the bridegroom is from a family of lower prestige than the other, it is said that he (or she) 'destroys' the νταμάρι of the other partner. For it is thought that in the family which results from a marriage both partners have contributed their blood 'to make one blood' which is unique and on whose purity the prestige and honour of the new family depends.

In a similar manner both husband and wife contribute wealth to the elementary family which they establish. The corporate property of a family is a common stock of animals, money, and goods, from which sons and daughters must be endowed. Daughters receive their portion as dowry at the moment of marriage, but the married sons normally continue to live in an extended family group where family wealth is still held in common. In the eventual partition of this joint household and its property, which is delayed until all the daughters have been married, and generally occurs five to ten years after the marriage of the eldest son, equal shares of stock and other assets are received by each son; but in the case of the youngest son an extra half-share is provided for the maintenance of each surviving parent who by custom remains in the household of this son. When an elementary family leaves the joint household of married brothers, the husband's family has probably contributed about 100 sheep and goats and one or two mules while the wife's family has supplied in the form of her dowry (προικιό) the furnishings of the hut and sufficient clothes and finery for the bride to wear or display for a period of ten years or more. The value of such a dowry is about £150, or the equivalent of 50 sheep. Since 1945, however, the practice has grown up of demanding from the bride's family about forty sheep or their equivalent in gold sovereigns in addition to the traditional dowry. Thus approximately under the traditional convention, and more rigorously today, there exists a certain balance between the wealth that passes into a new family from the husband's family of origin and that which is contributed by the wife's family of origin. It would be wrong to think of the dowry merely as a payment made by a bride's family to obtain a husband for her. Certainly there have been cases where girls who had physical or moral deficiencies have had to pay large dowries to get any kind of husband at all. It is also true that calculations of family prestige are concerned in the size of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

dowry. But the implicit purpose of the dowry is to complement the wealth with which the new family is or will be endowed by the husband's family. In this sense the handing over of the dowry is the first act of socially regulated co-operation between two previously unrelated and therefore hostile families. The two parties to the marriage contract co-operate to establish a new group. Each side contributes one of its members and a certain amount of property. And, under the traditional custom at least, the contribution of each side appropriately reflects the complementary activities of the two partners. The husband provides the animals, the wife the furnishings of the hut. And this bilateral endowment of a new family with property from both families of origin is also observed in the limiting case where a man has no sons and marries his youngest girl to a bridegroom who is willing to live in his father-in-law's home. In this instance it is the bridegroom who contributes wealth at the moment of marriage, bringing with him his share in the flocks of his family of birth, while the property of the wife's family of origin, which may be considerable, does not formally come under the control of the new family until the wife's father has retired from active work.

Just as the elements of wealth and prestige are inherited through both the mother and the father, so the Sarakatsani also believe that a child inherits the elements of its moral character from both parents, although, since the important moral qualities in this community are sex-linked, sons are thought to form their moral character essentially after the pattern of their fathers, especially with reference to manliness, while daughters particularly inherit those qualities of the mother which affect their sense of sexual shame. Nevertheless the pattern of character and behaviour, which a son partly inherits and partly learns from his father, may be modified by elements which he receives from his mother; and in the same way a girl may inherit some character traits from her father. Sometimes facets of character which are passed from or through the parent of opposite sex may be referred to the individual's χούτ. This is an aspect of personality to which one may attribute those idiosyncratic actions and attitudes which are in some way unusual or even deviant. The Sarakatsani insist that this is as likely to be inherited from one side of the family as from the other. John Charisis tears his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

827 828 shirts to shreds when he dances at weddings. This odd behaviour is not approved, but in terms of χούτ it may, at least, be explained; and it is remembered that his mother's brother, although he did not tear his shirts, used to waste his substance in another way by gambling at cards for high stakes, which he could not afford.

●59 612 It is clear, then, that the elements of wealth, prestige, and character pass into a family from both the families which enter into the original betrothal contract. This not only reflects the bilateral and symmetrical form of the kindred but in some measure helps to maintain it. For, if a man has contracted a judicious marriage with a girl from a family of at least equivalent prestige, the children will be anxious to associate with their matrilateral kin. On the other hand, it is noticeable that where a man has married into a family of lower prestige than his own (that is, where prestige has not been equally inherited from both sides), his children tend to evade obligations to their mother's kinsmen while they carefully cultivate kinsmen of the father. However, if a wife brings a substantial dowry (that is, where a newly established family is equally endowed with wealth from both sides), the husband is obliged to be particularly helpful to the family and kinsmen of his wife, and this leads to close relations between his children and their maternal cousins.

612 The bilateral structure of the kindred implies, of course, that this association of kinsmen is not a corporate group. Its definition must always be relative to a particular group of siblings.[a] At a wedding, when representatives of all sections of the bridegroom's kindred gather round him in support against the kindred of the bride, the illusion is created that two solidary corporate groups of kinsmen are involved. But in fact they are only united in the particular context of the wedding and by reason of each individual's personal kinship relation to the bridegroom. Indeed since any particular kindred comprises descendants of four pairs of unrelated great-grandparents, only the sibling group which is central to this kindred is related to all

[113] [a] This has long been recognized. See Bertha Phillpotts, *Kindred and Clan*, Cambridge, 1913, pp. 3, 275. However, it should be clear that corporate associations of kinsmen may exist in this kind of community. But other criteria will be involved, not merely kinship relationship.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

occupy, before marriage, a socially equivalent status, but become, after their marriages, the points of departure of distinct collateral lines of descent.

At the beginning of this chapter I described the multiform character of the family. It is a domestic group, an economic and property-owning unit, a quasi-political association, a religious communion, and so on. It is now evident that the elementary family group is the only stable solidary unit associated with the kindred and that while it enjoys important support from collateral kinsmen, it is also, in a sense, isolated from them. The immense importance, then, of this social group on the one hand, and its lack of continuity through time on the other, mean that the institutionalized arrangements for its establishment or dissolution, for the transference of categorical rights and obligations from an old family to a new, are of critical importance. Underlying the nature of these arrangements is the simple fact that each individual during some part of his lifetime is almost always the member of two families: one of origin, the other of marriage.[16] A man is a son and brother in one family, a father and husband in the other; a woman is a daughter and sister in the family of origin, a mother and wife in the family of marriage. It is obviously important that the rights and duties of these different roles, when played by the same individual, should not conflict. This is a problem for all systems of kinship, but it is especially acute in this community because all the individual's significant rights and obligations inhere in the family and in no other group. The individual passes from his first family to his second through marriage. In the case of the woman the solution of the problem of conflicting roles is radical; she leaves the home of her father, who ceases to have any rights over her except the residual right of resuming his power over her if she becomes a widow before the birth of children. The protection of her honour is no longer the concern of her brothers, and her working services now belong exclusively to the husband's family. When later she pays one of her rare visits to her original home, she may not spin even a handful of her mother's wool. The husband does not shed the categorical obligations of his roles as son

[16] An individual may have membership in a third family; for the grandparents, after the division of the joint household, normally live as members of the family of marriage of their youngest son.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

and sibling quite so rapidly, though it is significant that after his marriage and even before the birth of his children he is unlikely to undertake a vengeance killing for a murdered brother or a dishonoured sister. Eventually, after five to ten years, but often sooner, he parts from the extended family and from all his remaining categorical rights and obligations as son and brother.

Thus siblings before their marriages are a unity for a person outside the group. If he injures or insults any member of the group, he attacks the whole group, every male member of which is under equal obligation to retaliate. At this stage siblings of the same sex are socially equivalent as to status, there is an almost complete identity of interest, and their mutual relations are governed by a consciousness of their common filiation to the same parents. After the marriages of the brothers and sisters of a sibling group the situation entirely changes. They no longer form a unity against the outsider nor are they socially equivalent; they have become differentiated by their marriages and young families. Their interests are no longer identified, and siblings both in form and effect are now merely collaterals. There is a growing tendency to isolation from all collateral lines, not only those of the individual's own siblings. The supreme value in a man's life now becomes the economic welfare and social prestige of his children. He is, therefore, not always free to give unreserved and unthinking aid to his brothers and cousins as he used to do. Moreover, he is now forced, also for the sake of his children, who derive the half of their kindred through their mother, to consolidate his relationship with his affines. This he can only do by weakening to some degree the previously exclusive solidary relations between himself and his brothers and sisters.

Always implicit in Sarakatsan kinship relations is the interplay of the two notions of sibling solidarity and parental obligation. Parental obligation, of course, is established through legitimate marriage and the resulting conjugal relationship, but the very strength of the latter relation is founded on the sacred character of parental love and duty. In the elementary family the two principles of sibling solidarity and parental obligation are complementary and together guide its members in their duties and exclusive affections. But in the relations of married

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

[1-59]

IV

THE EXTENDED FAMILY

1. THE STATUS OF THE BRIDE

I HAVE said that the Sarakatsan family is an isolated and autonomous social group and I have stressed the moral solidarity which characterizes the relations of its members. But the Sarakatsan family, like all domestic groupings, passes through a cycle of development which in this instance begins with the marriage of a man with a woman and normally ends with the final division of the family's flocks between their sons one or two years after the youngest has married. An examination of some aspects of this process makes it possible to give an account of the institutions governing the redistribution of rights over property and persons which accompanies the development of new families and the dispersion of the older groups which have brought them into being. But the autonomy, solidarity, and isolation of the family make this transition difficult and critical. It is not only that it causes individuals real psychological distress when a girl at her marriage must abandon the family of her birth or when another family must receive a strange woman into the circle of their close and exclusive relationships. The marriages of any group of siblings have to be arranged in such a way that the family derives the maximum of prestige from them; and also that individuals relinquish their obligations to the family of origin only when these have been fulfilled, or have been safely delegated to another unmarried member of the group.

A description of the cycle of family development serves a second purpose. It documents the changing relations in the sibling group which are precipitated by the marriages of its members. The solution of the conflict between parents' newly assumed obligations to infant children and their long established duties and affections to siblings and parents in the family of origin, illustrates the distinction between the relatives of the family and the collateral-relatives of the kindred. Indeed, this conflict is, as it were, the growing point of the distinction.

In a formal sense the elementary family is established on the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

582 602 612 619 of the community and the constant proliferation, through marriages, of new relationships between opposed families; and in the other, a moral participation in the affairs of the different local segments of the geographically dispersed community. In both cases these considerations depend ultimately on the simple fact that 'kinsmen' and 'strangers' represent opposed but complementary categories of persons.

* * *

602 612 This completes the discussion of the general characteristics of Sarakatsan kinship and marriage. Naturally the consequent system of personal relations has various implications beyond the field of kinship behaviour. Here I will indicate only one of these, but one that is peculiarly characteristic of Greek society and will continue to concern us in the chapters that follow.

59 602 612 571 As we have seen, the community from the viewpoint of each individual is divided into kinsmen and non-kinsmen, 'own people' and 'strangers'. The division is unequivocal; kinsmen inspire loyalty and obligation, strangers distrust and moral indifference. Yet within the category of kinsmen itself the only stable solidary group is the family. Plainly, the nature of the physical and social environment is such that it forces this small group, however it may value the ideal of autarky, to cultivate both intensively and extensively the support of kinsmen and affines. But for reasons inherent in the structure of the kindred, which it has been my purpose in this and the three preceding chapters to analyse, that support is contingent upon a kinsman's prior commitments to his own family. Thus the family emerges as a social isolate in two associated respects. In the first case, families unrelated by kinship admit virtually no moral obligation towards one another; in the second, families related by kinship nevertheless owe only conditional services. In a 59 community where social relations are marked by such radical 602 discontinuities it follows that the primary values are necessarily 597 particularistic. The mutual opposition of family groups is expressed through the concept of honour with its connotations of exclusiveness, not the morality of universal values such as honesty or fair dealing. And Christian virtues such as humility, meekness, and self-effacement suggest only weakness; whereas

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

strength is simulated better by the heroic attitudes of self-assertion, pride, and even arrogance. Strength, individual prepotence, is what each man needs to be an effective protagonist for his family, and the protector of its public reputation and honour against the calumnies of those who are also its judges.

59 ●
602
577

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

554 and fearful that he may leave his dependants without a pro-
577 tector. But although the predicament of a man in this position is
596 appreciated by other Sarakatsani, it scarcely mitigates the loss of prestige. If a man has no adult son to protect his daughter's virtue, the fault is his. For weakness is despised. In itself it tends to diminish the prestige of a family even before it has led to dishonour. And men who are isolated without brothers or [156] sons are noticeably less proud, less confident, and in some cases are, by Sarakatsan standards, pathetically diffident and nervous—overt personality traits which I have not observed in men born into large sibling groups with a number of brothers.

(B) WEALTH

59 Τὸ βιό is the property owned by a family, particularly its
554 flocks of sheep and goats, the mules and horses. Although money
556 invested in other objects of prestige such as village houses is important, animals in a pastoral community are the significant form of wealth and a critical element in social reputation.

Today there are few families that own more than five hundred [235] sheep and goats. A household with more than 150 animals holds a respectable position in the community, one with 80 to 120 animals is on the brink of poverty, while a group with less than 40 animals is despicably poor. Yet the question of wealth is not quite so simple as this arithmetical scale might suggest. The Myriounis extended family of five brothers have 476 animals. Only the flocks of two other families in the Neochori local group exceed theirs in size. So long as they remain a single family with this large flock and five adult men to serve and protect it, the family is clearly, in this respect, a group of high prestige among the Neochori shepherds and indeed in the total community. But when the family is forced to divide into a group of autonomous families, each brother will possess only 80–90 sheep and goats; it may, therefore, seem that at a single stroke they will fall from one end of the wealth-prestige scale to the other. In fact, however, so long as the families of a group of brothers hold together in a co-operative association, folding their sheep together in a single flock (although with different ear-signs), they continue to derive some prestige from the aggregate number of their animals. Still it will now be said, for instance, that Theodoros has only 80 sheep and goats of his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

own, but four children to provide for. As soon as people begin to calculate in this manner, the inadequacy of his personal wealth emerges, and to some extent his prestige falls. Men with no brothers who are forced to join the 'company' of a cousin or an affine gain some prestige and cover from the size of the co-operating group of which they form a part, but the size of their own flock is always very precisely appreciated by outsiders. The worst situation is that of the family head with only a few animals who is forced to become a wage shepherd to an unrelated man, since in this case poverty associated with dependence on a stranger destroys prestige.

Taken together, numbers and wealth are the necessary material foundation for high family prestige. They imply the independence of the family within the community, both economically in the sense that the group is viable (and possibly free of debt), and technically in that it has enough manpower to manage its flocks unaided. It suggests that the family will possess powerful patrons outside the community and that in the competition for winter pastures it will be in a better position to rent grazing land. A village generally prefers to let an area of reasonable size, and to negotiate with a prosperous group able to provide a steady and profitable flow of bribes and presents.

Also, it is the family of wealth and numbers, with powerful patrons and sufficient winter grazing, that draws to itself a number of less fortunate kinsmen. The dependence and support of these men make the protecting family the nucleus of a co-operative association, extending yet further its strength, influence, and prestige. It attracts many passing visits from other kinsmen. Men do not often visit kinsmen of low prestige, since such association only draws attention to a relationship which is best forgotten: on the other hand, they take every opportunity to pay a call on a kinsman of position and repute, to cultivate a relationship that is a source of possible support in future misfortune and, of itself, brings a measure of vicarious prestige.

Men like Pistiolis, who are at the lowest level of the community hierarchy of prestige, seldom receive a visitor from one year's end to another. Indeed, the number of visitors that a family receives is generally a reliable index of its reputation. It is

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had guests (μουσαφίρηδες); their quality, relationship, and the possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism, encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality (φιλοξενία), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of competition.

(c) LINEAGE[1]

Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relationships which a man inherits from both his father and mother; and the importance of this for prestige has already been discussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least, reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed, a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation, but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral. In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

[1] Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

particularist. They have a moral content of their own but they cannot be referred to any universal moral principle.

For the Sarakatsani, family honour is the chief concern. Indeed, the honour of community or nation is, in their view, a projection of the concept of family honour. This honour is shared in two senses; intensively, by those whose reputation is identified by their membership in the same family; extensively, by the community of families sharing in common a system of values by which they judge one another's position and performance. Honour depends not upon the consciences of the individuals in a family whose reputation is under scrutiny, but on the concessions and reluctant approval of other families. Most of these are unrelated and hostile. Since the threat of denigration is continuous, it must be balanced by the repeated exhibition of those qualities that support honour and prestige: self-assertive courage in men, modest virtue in women. In the one case by social convention, in the other by its negative character, the presence of these qualities is more often revealed by attitudes and appearances than substantive proof. There is an emphasis on opinions and appearances, not facts. The consequences of action rather than the intentions behind it are important. This does not mean that private shame for undiscovered failure does not exist. But, inevitably, ideas about individual moral responsibility are blurred, and undiscovered shame is not as morally serious as public disgrace.

Reputation is impossible without strength. Poverty is a mark of failure, not a virtue. Strength in sheep and in men encourages others to respect a family's honour, it attracts dependent kinsmen whose support further extends influence and prestige. Honour and strength are linked. If a family is without sons the call of honour may find a man in the dilemma that if honour is lost the moral existence of the family collapses, or if honour is vindicated his family becomes a leaderless group of women and children dependent on the generosity of kinsmen, a condition which must eventually affect prestige and, perhaps, honour as well. Honour, and the obligation to die for it, is the ideal value, but the sacrifice necessarily weakens the family. Honour remains integral, but becomes more vulnerable. A family needs at least one man in the role of unmarried brother whose unreflecting courage guards its

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

honour, and one man in the role of married leader whose prudence and self-control secures its material strength. This possibility depends on the number of sons in a family and the stage of its development. Yet in the critical and unfriendly view of others a family must always be in a position to defend itself against outrage. Weakness is shameful and circumstances never excuse it. The corollary to this notion is that, within limits, it is normally preferable to insult than to be insulted, to exploit than to be exploited.

The emphasis on strength appears in the importance, in moral judgements, of health, effectiveness (δραστηριότης), skill and cleverness. Skill conserves material strength; animals are less likely to become diseased, inferior pastures are not chosen. A man ought to be 'able' in the sense of able to provide, and he needs cleverness of the kind that foresees future threats in time. Health is imperative in this scheme of things; chronic sickness or deformity is inexcusable. There is little sentimentality. Questions of honour are not complicated by notions of chivalrous conduct. An honour killing is accomplished without warning by a bullet fired from behind cover, or a knife in the back. This does not mean that Sarakatsani are cowards; they are, in fact, immensely brave. But, continually, the accent is on effective action, the achievement of success, the avoidance of failure. Ends matter more than means. Consequently, those qualities and attributes that are necessary for strength tend to be considered as morally good, those that lead to weakness as morally bad. Sarakatsani would condemn any display of excessive altruism on the grounds that it inevitably weakens a person's own family and strengthens the family of another; it would be, at best, imprudent, and in a situation where it clearly damaged the interests of the family it would be immoral.

Strength and prowess, then, matter more than ethical goodness. Indeed a man is only good when he is also by implication, able and strong. Although aimless violence is dishonourable there is no missing the pleasure it gives when a man is forced to kill; nor the prestige which it brings him. For there is no more conclusive way of showing that you are stronger than by taking away the other man's life.

The form of this system of values is related to three features of the social structure: the first of these is the complementary

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

opposition of the sexes. It is consistent with the radical character of this opposition that most virtues are sex-linked. Since the sensuality of sex is a critical flaw in human nature, chastity becomes an important element in honour, around which those complementary virtues, the self-assertive qualities of the men, the modest constricted virtues of the women, are organized in defence. At the same time the moral superiority of the male sex in this opposition allows the main burden of the responsibility for original sin to be borne by the woman in a way that does not compromise the inherent nobility of man which is, necessarily, a premise of a system of values based on ideas of honour. And the complementary opposition of the two sexes and their ideal attributes allows the introduction of those quieter feminine virtues of love, modesty, and a disposition to co-operate, without inconsistency in relation to the self-assertive male values, and in the context of inner family life where they are most necessary to express the moral solidarity of the family and support those who face a hostile and competitive world.

The second relevant feature of social structure is the solidarity of the family, and the categorical nature of obligations between its members. This solidarity is both active and passive. Whatever is done or suffered by one member equally affects the honour and shame of the others. No actor stands in isolation without reference to his membership in a family. He carries always a weight of representative responsibility when his actions are observed or even speculated on by others. And, on the other hand, the family is a small group in which there is no security of anonymity when other members fail. In these circumstances, where there is individual responsibility but no certainty of individual justice, important values are variations on the theme of strength and weakness, success and failure. Without self-confidence, prepotence, and skill, a man is 'lost' (χαμένος), morally as well as practically.

The relationships of hostility between families unconnected by ties of kinship or marriage are the third feature of social structure. They are oppositions consistent with a particular form of bilateral kinship system, and the absence of any forms of political or economic co-operation other than those based on relationship or patronage. These potentially destructive

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

escape from the omnipotence of God and the futility of resistance, yet his humility is not entirely unconditional.

Man is noble but between him and God there is always a barrier of sin. Sarakatsani express this in the idea of 'a weight' (ένα βάρος) which depresses the spirit and in a literal sense draws man downwards away from God. The Sarakatsani, however, make a distinction between two kinds of sin, personal sin (οἱ ἁμαρτίες μας) and ancestral sin (οἱ ἁμαρτίες τοῦ Ἀδάμ). Both divide man from God but while the individual is wholly responsible for personal sins, he feels little sense of guilt for the other kind of sin which he sees as a pre-existing condition of the world into which he was born.

The sins for which a man is individually responsible fall into three categories. The first includes those acts which are wanton and personal insults to God Himself, acts in which a man shows himself to be impious (ἀσεβής) through a denial or mockery of God. Perjury is the greatest of these; for in this act a man calls upon God to witness the truth of his words, that is, he attempts the impossible task of implicating God as a collaborator in his lie. Although the Sarakatsanos lies as a matter of habit and policy at other times, it is only in situations of great difficulty that he will perjure himself.

The second category of personal sins relates to family life, and especially to certain fundamental and axiomatic attitudes and duties on which the moral solidarity of the family institution is based. The family for the Sarakatsanos is not merely a human and social group, it is a complex of relations divinely instituted and sanctioned by God. On a transcendent and spiritual plane, the Holy Family of God the Father, the Mother of Christ, and Christ the Son, is the archetype for all earthly families. As love, respect, compassion, relate the three Holy Persons, so these qualities ought to regulate the relations of the members of earthly families. Where this is not so there is a condition of sin and God's punishment may be expected. Thus this category of sins includes the unnecessary brutality of fathers towards small children; provoking a premature separation of sons' households; laziness or dereliction of duty which leads a family into serious want; in that sense, gambling or chronic drunkenness; public insult to a parent by a son or daughter; maltreatment of aged parents; striking a parent; physical violence